



# COUNTY of NAPA

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

1195 Third Street, Suite 310, Napa, CA 94559  
Office (707) 253-4386 FAX (707) 253-4176

July 22, 2008

The Honorable Raymond Guadagni  
Presiding Judge  
Superior Court of California, County of Napa  
825 Brown Street  
Napa, CA 94559

# FILED

JUL 30 2008

Clerk of the Napa Superior Court  
By: C. B...  
Deputy

Dear Judge Guadagni:

As required by Penal Code Section 933(c), enclosed is the response to the following 2007-08 Grand Jury Final Reports:

- Napa County Emergency Communications
- Napa County Office of Emergency Services
- Napa County Jail Department of Corrections
- Napa County Roads
- Napa County Juvenile Hall

Responses to findings and recommendations affecting local government entities other than the County are not included in the Board's response when those entities are not under the jurisdiction of the County Board of Supervisors.

Grand Jury activity takes place over the course of a number of months. As such, their findings and recommendations often address issues which county departments have already identified as problems and to which solutions are in the process of being developed. We note that a number of the Grand Jury's recommendations have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented at this time.

The Board acknowledges the members of the 2007-08 Grand Jury for the time they have devoted in preparing their report.

Received  
Napa Superior Court

JUL 22 2008

Court Executive Office

Sincerely,

Brad Wagenknecht, Chair  
Napa County Board of Supervisors

Enclosure

cc: Foreman, 2007-08 Grand Jury

BRAD WAGENKNECHT  
DISTRICT 1

MARK LUCE  
DISTRICT 2

DIANE DILLON  
DISTRICT 3

BILL DODD  
DISTRICT 4

HAROLD MOSKOWITE  
DISTRICT 5

**NAPA COUNTY  
RESPONSE TO THE NAPA COUNTY GRAND JURY  
FINAL REPORT ON NAPA COUNTY  
EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

Finding No. 6: Napa Central Dispatch places a separate landline call to CAL FIRE ECC rather than conferencing the call with 911 callers. This action precludes the ECC from receiving E-911 caller ID information without resorting to additional hardware or software modifications.

Response, Napa County Fire Chief: The Fire Chief disagrees partially with the finding. While conferencing 911 calls is one method that would assure the transfer of caller ID information, it is not the only alternative. Additionally, call conferencing brings on other issues such as delaying Emergency Medical Dispatch instructions while ECC is being brought into the call and “dead time” during the connecting process adding potential for caller confusion. Further analysis is needed to completely explore alternative methods and procedures prior to determining the most appropriate process for all potential circumstances.

Finding No. 11: CAL FIRE ECC dispatch personnel appear to be unaware of the Napa County Fire Department dispatch policies.

Response, Napa County Fire Chief: The Fire Chief disagrees with the finding. CAL FIRE ECC personnel are aware of Napa County Department dispatch policies. Dispatching is a very dynamic environment with constant inputs and updated information. Numerous times incidents turn out to be “not as reported”, meaning that the initial information received from a call is inaccurate; resulting in a perception that the wrong type of incident was dispatched. As additional or confirming information is received the dispatch is adjusted by the ECC with consultation from the Incident Commander if appropriate.

Finding No. 14: Combining existing primary PSAP (Public Safety Answering Point) functions into a single consolidated PSAP would appear to better serve the citizens of Napa County than the current system.

Response, Board of Supervisors: The Board disagrees with the finding. The consolidation of PSAP functions and/or dispatch functions (it is somewhat unclear what the Grand Jury really intends to recommend here) requires further analysis. There are technological and procedural solutions that could be less costly and time consuming than physical consolidation of facilities to correct the findings in the report. Whether there should be a consolidated PSAP/Dispatch Center in Napa County, which agency should operate a consolidated PSAP and/or dispatch center and where any such PSAP and/or dispatch center should be located are issues that will require

additional analysis and, depending on the results of that analysis, discussions and negotiations with the cities and other public safety agencies.

Recommendation No. 1: The Berryessa Peak public safety radio repeater be equipped with a microwave relay system.

Response, Napa County Executive Officer: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The Board of Supervisors has approved a budget for the County Communications division that includes the costs to purchase and install the recommended equipment. The recommendation will be completed as part of the current Atlas Peak radio site replacement construction project under way within the County Public Works and Communications departments. The current schedule for completing the new site is spring of 2009.

Recommendation No. 3: As an interim policy, the Napa Central Dispatch PSAP immediately begin to “conference” the CAL FIRE ECC on fire dispatch or medical/fire dispatch calls.

Response, Board of Supervisors: The recommendation requires further analysis to identify the most appropriate method to assure critical information is transferred between agency dispatch centers. Representatives from Napa Central Dispatch PSAP and Cal Fire ECC are meeting to discuss the alternatives available and will be making a recommendation to the Board within the next 30-60 days with implementation following immediately thereafter. “Conferencing” calls is one process available, but has some limitations that can be overcome by other methods or a combination of methods that together can assure a more accurate transfer of information on a routine basis as well as during normal workloads and at times of extreme volume and stress.

Recommendation No. 4: CAL FIRE ECC dispatchers be made aware of the requirements of the Napa County Fire Department dispatch related procedures.

Response, Napa County Fire Chief: The recommendation has been implemented and is part of the orientation training required of all new employees in the Emergency Command Center. The current dispatch policy and procedures handbook is being reorganized and updated. This will be completed in the next 60 days. Each current employee will then be required to review the new and existing dispatch policies and procedures manual. Training on all newly implemented policies and procedures are documented utilizing the Department’s procedures (Illness & Injury Prevention Program forms). This documentation will be maintained by the supervisor in the Emergency Command Center.

Recommendation No. 5: On an urgent basis the Napa County PSAPs institute formal quality assurance programs, preferably audited by outside third party organizations qualified in the area of emergency communications.

Response, Napa County Board of Supervisors: While the Board acknowledges the need for a formal quality assurance program, the Board has no authority to implement this recommendation at the City of Napa, Calistoga and St. Helena PSAPs. The recommendation involves processes and procedures initiated by each of the PSAPs that are under the authority of the City of Napa, Calistoga and St. Helena respectively rather than the County of Napa. Via a formal agreement, Napa County Sheriff's department PSAP/dispatch functions are administered by Napa Central Dispatch PSAP which is under the authority of the City of Napa. Therefore, this recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it is not reasonable. However, consistent with the recommendation, County staff will enter into discussions with the City of Napa regarding implementing formal quality assurance programs based on the agreement for PSAP/dispatch service.

Recommendation No. 6: The Master Plan be modified to include a consolidated Napa County PSAP and planning be initiated to establish the facility.

Response, Napa County Board of Supervisors: The recommendation will not be implemented by the County because it is not reasonable.<sup>1</sup> The Grand Jury's recommendation calls for the creation of a consolidated PSAP but it appears that they may actually intend to recommend the full consolidation of both PSAP and dispatch functions (see Finding No. 14), though this is not entirely clear. Whether there should be a consolidated PSAP/dispatch Center in Napa County, which agency should operate a consolidated PSAP/dispatch center, and where any such PSAP/dispatch center should be located are issues that will require additional analysis. Depending on the results of that analysis, discussions and negotiations with the cities and other public safety agencies will be necessary. As noted in the Grand Jury Report, the cities of St.

---

<sup>1</sup> None of the four possible responses established by section 933.05 of the California Penal Code fit precisely as an appropriate response to this recommendation. Possible responses are as follows: (1) the recommendation has been implemented; or (2) the recommendation has not yet been implemented; or (3) the recommendation requires further analysis; or (4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Both responses (1) and (2) are not appropriate in this case. While the recommendation requires further analysis, the timeframe would likely exceed the limit (six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report) established in order to use response (3). Response (4) is used by default until further analysis can be complete as described in the detailed response above.

Helena and Calistoga desire to maintain their own PSAPs in order to provide more personal, local service. The Board of Supervisors has no authority to mandate that these entities consolidate their PSAPs with the Napa Central Dispatch PSAP operated by the City of Napa for the City and, under contract, for the Cities of American Canyon, Yountville and the unincorporated County. Additionally, CAL FIRE policy does not allow fire dispatch services to be performed by anyone other than CAL FIRE. Therefore, any full consolidation would likely require the county/cities/public safety agencies to contract with the state, and it might not be willing to provide such combined services. Further, because the CAL FIRE PSAP/dispatch is a centralized state facility serving the six counties of the Sonoma-Lake-Napa Unit, it is possible that a centralized PSAP/dispatch center would not be physically located in Napa. Finally, CAL FIRE currently serves as the backup PSAP for Napa Central Dispatch PSAP. Should CAL FIRE become the primary PSAP/dispatch center, plans for a backup PSAP would need to be established.

It is not entirely clear from the Grand Jury's report what problem(s) such physical consolidation would solve. The report notes that "for all intents and purposes, the Napa Central Dispatch PSAP does serve as a consolidated PSAP for Napa County" and that the "interface between Napa Central Dispatch and CAL FIRE ECC seems to cause the most confusion." More analysis is required but there are technological and procedural solutions that could be less costly and time consuming than physical consolidation of facilities to accommodate this assertion. The report also notes that the "physical location of this PSAP [should be] to provide convenient access to the users." It is unclear why users of the PSAP have a need to access the physical location of the center itself or why this would be a concern.

County staff will review this issue further to determine (1) what additional analysis may be needed related to the costs and benefits of PSAP/dispatch center consolidation and (2) whether, in light of current workload and other factors, it makes sense to proceed at this time with that analysis, as well as, any related negotiations and/or discussions with the various municipalities and public safety agencies regarding PSAP/dispatch center consolidation and operation.